

## Garfield's Record With Respect to Pensions.

Mr. James A. Garfield, the Republican nominee for President, is on record as an opponent of the bill providing that pensions to Union soldiers or their widows shall date from the discharge or death of the person on whose account the pension has been or shall be granted, and extending the time for the filing of applications for the same. On January 16, 1872, Hon. K. Milton Spear, Democratic Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, asked unanimous consent of the House to report this bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Mr. Garfield, of Ohio, objected. This single objection prevented Mr. Spear from reporting the bill.—See *Congressional Globe for the Forty-second Congress, 2d Session, page 414.*

On January 17, 1872, reports from committees being in order in the House, Mr. Spear, when the Committee on Invalid Pensions was called, reported from that committee the bill to which Mr. Garfield had made objection the previous day. The bill passed without a division or call of the yeas and nays.—See *Congressional Globe for the Forty-second Congress, 2d Session, page 437.*

On January 29, 1872, Mr. Garfield, of Ohio, asked unanimous consent to offer a resolution requesting the Senate (to which body Mr. Spear's bill had been sent) to return the bill in question to the House. Debate immediately arose and Mr. Garfield moved to suspend the rules in order that he might bring his resolution before the House. In the course of the debate Mr. Garfield asserted that many of the pensions already granted were fraudulent and that the bill had been passed without due consideration by the House. Mr. Moore, Republican of Illinois, defended the bill and the action of the House thereon. Mr. Maynard, Republican of Tennessee, (now Postmaster General) replied to Mr. Garfield by propounding this question: "If so many of these pensions are fraudulent, why does not the Commissioner of Pensions correct the fraud?" and added, "He (the Commissioner) has ample power to do it." To which Mr. Garfield failed to make reply.—See *Congressional Globe for the Forty-second Congress, 2d Session, page 437.*

Mr. Garfield made a very bitter and angry speech against the proposition to date pensions from the time of the discharge or death of the person on whose account they had been or might be granted. He said: "Now shall we, by one stroke of the pen, by one act that took us but a minute to pass, make our pension laws, and all pensions under those laws, revert back to the period when the injury was received, and at a single blow add more than thirty-two million dollars to the expenses of this Government without any investigation at all?" He also charged that about one-fourth of all the pensions that had then been granted were fraudulently obtained, and that the strongest cases presented to the Pension Bureau were those gotten up on forged evidence. He said, to use his own words, that "the man who gets up a thoroughly rotten case, would, when he started out to lie, do so strongly and unscrupulously, and hence his papers would be prepared in the most complete and convincing manner." In other words, he branded the pensioners whose cases were presented in the strongest light as forgers and perjurers. But the House refused to listen to Mr. Garfield's violent denunciation of the bill, and on the question being put on his motion to suspend the rules, there were but fifty-five ayes, though more than two hundred members were present. Had Mr. Garfield succeeded in his motion, the bill would probably have been defeated and might not have become a law to this day. In that event, thousands of crippled defenders of the Union, and thousands of women widowed and children made fatherless by the war, would now be homeless and suffering the bitter pangs of poverty. Had Mr. Garfield shown a like disposition to economize the public moneys when he reported appropriations for the District of Columbia ring and voted for subsidies for gigantic and grasping corporations, he could at least plead consistency in extenuation of his assault upon the pensioners. But in view of his well-known course in that regard, his bitter opposition to the back-pension bill has the appearance of having been inspired by a desire to save pensions only to spend in appropriations demanded by the lobby. The soldiers of the country will do well to look up Mr. Garfield's record on subjects affecting their interests.—*Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot.*

## An Unfortunate Year for Republicans.

It is an unfortunate year for the Republicans. They began by holding a Convention which lasted a week, and came near ending in a fight of factions, and at its close nominated a man whom one of the leading editors of the party declared had no record to run upon. And for the excellent reason that he had taken bribes, committed bribery, sold his influence as Chairman of the Committee of Appropriations to the vendors of a pavement, and Boss Shepherd, of the District Ring, for \$5,000. Then at Conkling's dictation, they nominated for Vice-President a man whom a Republican President had dismissed from the Collectorship in New York for malfeasance in office, and whom a Republican Secretary of the Treasury had declared should be removed, in order that the office might be honestly and efficiently administered. His nomination was an insult to the Republican Administration, while the nomination of Garfield was an insult to the intelligence and honesty of the American people. This was misfortune No. 1.

Misfortunes never come singly. Republican misfortune No. 2 was in making Marshall Jewell—the biscuit contractor and grabber of a poor woman's estate—Chairman of the National Committee, and ex-Senator Dorsey, of Arkansas—who was involved in the worst jobs of the old District Ring—Secretary of the Committee. It was a good deal like stationing a drunkard and a gambler at the door of a saloon to advertise its character and induce respectable people to enter it. The total surrender of Garfield to the stalwarts of the party, swallowing all his fine professions,

and agreeing to throw civil service reform to the dogs, and wave the bloody shirt, was misfortune No. 3. It destroyed what little claim he had to support, and left respectable Republicans who had convictions with nothing to stand upon. Misfortune No. 4 followed when a conference was held in New York, at which it was agreed to let principles slide and run the campaign on cash principles; and as there was no use in wasting money on the South, it should be concentrated on the September and October States, beginning with Vermont and Maine. Blaine declaring that if the Republicans lost Maine Garfield's defeat was sure, and Garfield himself confessing that if the Republicans did not carry New York all would be lost. Misfortune No. 5 came when, in spite of all the money wrung out of Federal officeholders and employees and poured out in the autumn States, Vermont barely held her own, and Maine gave the Republicans a crushing defeat notwithstanding all the efforts to count in their candidate for Governor. The effect of this staggering blow has been felt from one end of the country to the other. And on the top of this disaster, as misfortune No. 6, Senator Conkling delivered his great speech, the pronouncement of the Republican party, announcing its policy for the future—a speech which declared war against one-half of the Union, and opened all the wounds and rekindled all the worst passions of a rebellion which was suppressed fifteen years ago. This announcement has startled the whole country, and patriotic, peace-loving citizens everywhere condemn it. "No more sectional strife!" is the cry of the people of all parts of the Union.

But the most serious event of the season to the unfortunate Republicans was the nomination of General Winfield Scott Hancock, at Cincinnati, by the Democracy of the Union. This heroic soldier and acknowledged statesman, against whom his worst political enemies—and he has no other enemies—can bring no accusation, has every qualification for the Presidency, and has the respect, the confidence and the gratitude of the people of all sections and classes. His nomination was received with enthusiasm, and the more his character is studied and his acts are understood, the stronger his hold on the public becomes. Already there are the beginnings of a popular uprising in his favor, and there is no doubt that he will be carried into office on the crest of a tidal wave of popular enthusiasm. The nomination of Hancock was Republican misfortune No. 7, and now it has been followed by another, misfortune No. 8, the complete union of the Democracy of New York. This happy result has destroyed all chance for Republican dickerings, and makes the Empire State certain for Hancock and English by a majority of at least 40,000, and will go far to secure the next Legislature and the election of a Democratic Senator next winter. It has been a year of disasters to the Republicans, but all their misfortunes are gains to the Democracy and will inure to the benefit of the country. The best thing that can happen to the United States is the overthrow of the Republican party, which has become corrupt and dangerous, a foe to all the great interests of our people, and a menace to our institutions.—*Exchange.*

## The Tendency of Things.

The general tendency of things in this country is change from Republicanism to Democracy. Five years ago the lower house of Congress made this change; three years later the Senate followed the example. Missouri itself, now so strongly Democratic, was called Republican a few years ago; so was Indiana; so was Ohio, which is now Democratic nearly half the time; even Maine, the "Pine Tree State," as it is lovingly known in Republican nomenclature, has either ceased to be Republican or is Republican only by the skin of its teeth. The old city of Boston, the fountain-head of Republicanism, has become a Democratic city, and the permits for the use of Faneuil Hall are now issued by Democratic officials. Republicans of National or local prominence who have turned their backs on Garfield and espoused the cause of Hancock may be counted by the hundreds in the country. Butler, Julian and Forney have their imitators all over the land.

Senator Conkling cannot understand, or he pretends he cannot understand, the disappearance of the large Republican vote in some of the Southern States, and he boldly asserts that white intimidation alone can account for it. But if the Senator will take a look over the country he will find that what he regards as a local phenomenon is a general one; it is not confined to the South; it extends to the North. There was a very interesting exhibition of it away up on the Penobscot and Kennebec rivers. Senator Conkling asks what has become of the former Republican majority in South Carolina? We might reply by asking what has become of the former 28,000 Republican majority in Maine; the former Republican majority in Missouri; the former Republican majority in Indiana, Ohio, New York, Connecticut and New Jersey? The answer to one question will probably contain the answer to the other; the former Republican majorities in the Southern States have gone the same way with the former Republican majorities in some of the Northern States—into the Democratic party. Would the Senator have Alabama continue to be Republican after Boston has abandoned Republicanism? Would he deny the negroes of Louisiana the right enjoyed and exercised by the whites of Maine? If Butler, Julian, Forney and hundreds of other well-known white men in the North turn Democrats may not the colored people of the South do so?

If the exercise of force will explain the phenomenon in one case it is not necessary to look to intimidation to explain it in the other. The country is evidently tired of Republicanism. It proved this four years ago, when it gave a Democratic popular majority of over a quarter of a million votes; and it will prove it again, even to the conviction of Senator Conkling, in November, when it gives a still larger popular majority in favor of Hancock.—*St. Louis Republican.*

The men who were most bitterly opposed to the nomination of General Grant for President are now anxious to have his active influence for Garfield. They are too willing.

## Clear Case of Perjury.

Judge Black is General Garfield's witness, for on the only two public occasions when Garfield attempted to defend his corruption in the Credit Mobilier jobbery he put Judge Black on the witness stand. In 1873 Garfield paraded in a pamphlet he issued Judge Black's letter to Speaker Blaine, in which he defended Garfield's share in the bribery on the plea of ignorance. Garfield used this letter again in a speech to his constituents at Warren, Ohio, September, 1874.

This extract is from Judge Black's letter to the N. Y. Sun:

I will set down the substance and give my reply to each one in the order you put them: Did I mean in my letter to Mr. Blaine that General Garfield acknowledged the receipt of stock and dividends from Oakes Ames? Unquestionably he agreed to take the stock, and did receive dividends upon it. The letter plainly implies that he had not concealed, nor tried to conceal, that fact from him. But his admission was coupled with a statement which showed him to be guilty.

Judge Black here says, on the "admission" of Garfield to him, that "unquestionably he (Garfield) agreed to take the Credit Mobilier stock and did receive dividends on it."

Now let us see what was Garfield's testimony before the Poland Committee. On January 14, 1873, he went publicly before the Committee and swore upon the Gospels:

"I never owned, received, or agreed to receive any stock of the Credit Mobilier, or of the Union Pacific Railroad, nor any dividends or profits arising from any of them."

If this don't make Garfield out a perjurer then there is no distinction between truth and falsehood.

But Judge Black says Garfield's "admission" to him that he agreed to receive Credit-Mobilier stock and did receive dividends, was "coupled with a statement" that showed him to be guilty. What was this statement? Judge Black declared that at the time he agreed to receive the stock and received the dividends, he was ignorant of the connection between the Credit Mobilier and the Union Pacific Railroad. This convinced Judge Black that Garfield was guiltless.

But it was a lie. Of that there is conclusive proof in the debates of Congress. In December, 1867, when Ames began to distribute his stock, E. B. Washburne of Illinois, ex-Minister to France, and his brother, Governor Washburne of Wisconsin, exposed the whole operations of the Credit Mobilier in the House of Representatives, and showed the magnitude of the swindle, how it was to be consummated, and its connection with the Union Pacific Railroad, just as it is now known. The debate was on a resolution introduced by E. B. Washburne to reduce the rates of freight and passengers on the Pacific roads. Garfield was present in the House during these discussions and participated in them. Everybody knew then that the directors of the Union Pacific were contracting with themselves to build the road, and that the franchise of the old Credit Mobilier corporation had been purchased for that purpose. To suppose Garfield ignorant of a knowledge which was common at the time in the House and elsewhere, and that, too, when the whole business had been clearly exposed in several debates, wherein he had taken part and voted, is to insult public intelligence.

In what a pitiful plight this leaves Garfield. He not only perjured himself before the Poland Committee, but he deliberately lied to Judge Black and betrayed as to his motives by an infamous deception of his own confidential adviser and friend. And this is the sort of candidate the Republicans have put up for President?

The chances are that there will still be another letter from Judge Black as soon as the Judge gets hold of the *Congressional Globe* of 1867-'68, proving that Garfield, as preliminary to his perjury before the Poland Committee, lied to his confidential friend.—*Pittsburgh Post.*

## Is Garfield's Nomination Binding?

That no man is worthy of support for the office of President of the United States who could not enter upon a competitive canvass for the nomination with the least hope of success is a proposition that will be generally admitted.

The nominating conventions of parties are supposed to be fairly representative of the people. The supposition is somewhat of an assumption, but such bodies as the Chicago Convention, where the will of the people was trodden under foot in the defeat of Blaine, but the theory holds good that delegates are expected to represent their constituents. And we suppose it will not be denied that a man who, after thorough preliminary canvass, would be overwhelmingly rejected by a National convention of his party is not entitled to the support of that party.

When such a candidate is selected the delegates have failed in the performance of their duty, and their constituents are under no obligation to ratify their work. The principal is not bound by the acts of his agent when the latter violates instructions. If a man who is sent out to buy horses expends the money confided to him for that purpose in the purchase of cows or sheep, the employer has ground of action for the recovery of his money. He is not bound to accept the work of his agent as his own act.

This is precisely what was done at Chicago. The delegates were bound by all the usages of party to put up a man whom honest men could support. But, instead of selecting such a candidate, they made choice of a man whose candidacy would have been a monstrous absurdity had he entered the lists with Grant, Blaine and Sherman four or five months before the date for naming a ticket.

The question, What would have been the fate of General Garfield had he essayed the ordeal through which Grant, Blaine and Sherman passed last winter and spring in their competition for the Chicago prize, brings before the mind the picture of a shattered wreck taken away from the public gaze by discreet and pitying friends a month before the assembling of the delegates.

We don't believe there is an intelligent man in the United States who thinks General Garfield could have been nominated if his candidacy had been avowed when Blaine and Sherman were operating their respective bureaus.

Had he or his friends taken any step

calculated to challenge attention to his record, a blast of annihilation would have swept his presumptive candidacy out of sight.

He would have been hissed off the stage by the very men who are now working for his election—working for a man whom they despise, because their political fortunes are in the same boat with his.

All the terrible indictment now presented against him in the Democratic press, collated from Republican and official sources, would have been hurled at his head by those Republican journals that took up the respective causes of Grant, Blaine and Sherman, and he would have been compelled to crawl off the track—the saddest wreck of misdirected ambition that the country had ever seen.

And not only in the journals of his party, but in the millions of documents sent out by the bureaus, the back-salary grab, Credit-Mobilier and the De Coler infamy would have been put in their worst light. And the effect would have been a cyclone of popular indignation, an indignant protest of the Republican masses against the insolent presumption of a man with such a record aspiring to the chair of George Washington.

No honest man can feel that he is bound to attest his fealty to party by voting for such a candidate. The decency that would have rejected him as an aspirant last May is bound to reject him now.—*Washington Post.*

## Hancock's Nomination an Inspiration.

The nomination of General Hancock at Cincinnati was an inspiration. His name was not down on the bill. He was not the choice of the politicians. There was no Hancock "boom" when the delegates came together. But his name was in the air. The Convention took it up. It was magnetic. His nomination was spontaneous and inevitable. It united all parties, created unbounded enthusiasm, electrified the country.

The career of General Hancock justified the enthusiasm his nomination awakened. The young soldier gained the profound respect and regard of General Scott at West Point, and in the Mexican campaign, where he was promoted for meritorious services. The brave General Harney selected him for his most difficult campaign in the West. He was Lincoln's favorite General in the war, and the soldiers loved him as a brother, and were proud to follow him. He rose to the highest rank by a succession of brilliant deeds, and more than met each new responsibility with increased valor and fidelity. His course at New Orleans made him the representative of Constitutional law and civil authority. His letter to Governor Pease marked him as the champion of the rights and liberties of the people. His letter to General Sherman distinguished him as the embodiment of Democratic ideas. Without effort on his own part, without ambition, with no solicitation on the part of friends, backed by no party or clique, he has steadily risen in public regard and confidence, till he has become the Man of the Hour. No wonder that the venerable Dr. Junkin, the distinguished Presbyterian divine of Pennsylvania, prophesied that General Hancock would be President. He recognized in this modest hero-statesman the Man of Destiny.

Since his nomination at Cincinnati the people have embraced him. The veteran soldiers of the Union army, thousands of whom served under his able leadership, are massing in his support. Old Republicans, who joined with Sumner and Seward, and Chase, and Greeley, and Lincoln, and Trumbull and Davis in forming the Republican party, behold in him the representative of their principles and ideas, and are joining his standard. The German people, renowned for their intelligence and quiet virtues, recognize him as their ideal leader. The Southern people do honor to his courage, his chivalric virtues and his statesmanship. Capitalists trust him. Merchants know that he is safe. Conservative citizens rejoice to support a candidate who respects the best traditions of the Republic and has a stainless reputation. The people believe in him. From one end of the country to the other his name wakes the heartiest responses of popular confidence. Maine sends greeting to Ohio and Indiana. And the strongholds of Republicanism tremble at the irresistible wave of public sentiment in Hancock's favor. The fates are in his favor. His election seems to be preordained.

Hancock is the Man of Destiny. Everywhere the people feel that his election will restore the Government to its true principles, destroy sectional hatred and agitation, create confidence and good-will everywhere, give a new impetus to prosperity, and inaugurate an era of good feeling. All the best interests of the country will be promoted by his success. All the best hopes of the people are centered in his election. He has a name identified with the proudest events in our Nation's history—Winfield Scott, who led our victorious troops into the capital of Mexico, and John Hancock, who presided in the first Continental Congress, and was the first to sign his name to the Declaration of Independence. He combines the heroic qualities of the one and the civic virtues of the other, and clasps the two great epochs of our National existence together, while his own brilliant career illustrates its third. His star-to-day is in the ascendant and will continue to brighten.—*N. Y. Express.*

As a Complete Letter Writer General Hancock must be admitted to be a decided success. The Republican wisecracks who credited his New Orleans letter to Judge Black and his letter of acceptance to Mr. Tilden, have gone out of business, and now admit tacitly that the General does his own writing. It remains of record, however, that they have found in the correspondence of this "mere soldier" all the qualities which mark the productions of men of such admitted ability as Judge Black and Mr. Tilden. It has been observed, too, that when General Hancock writes a letter the bullet goes straight to its mark, and the thing hit never moves afterwards.—*N. Y. World.*

The two wings of the Democracy in Albany County, New York, are united. The two wings of the Republican party are wider apart than ever.

## POLITICAL POINTS.

—Mr. Blaine was right when he said "if Maine gives less than 2,000 majority, Hancock will be elected President."

—And to think that John Logan, down in Maine, smashed the English language into a thousand fragments for nothing.

—The Democratic storm is coming. It promises to be a terrific cyclone, sweeping Republicanism out of nearly every State in the Union. Democrats see it plainly and the more sagacious Republicans are sniffing it in the breeze.—*Indiana State Sentinel.*

—"If I were President I would veto all legislation which might come before me providing for the consideration or payment of claims of any kind for losses or damages by persons who were in the rebellion, whether pardoned or not."—*Winfield Scott Hancock, September 23.*

Ben Butler is still willing to admit, for the sake of argument, that the Republican party is the sole author of abundant crops in this country, but he hesitates to admit that the Republican party is the sole cause of short crops in countries beyond the seas. Butler is ruled out of the Republican party.—*Cincinnati Enquirer.*

The logic Republicans use for retaining possession of the Government would keep them in power forever. They insist the Government would go to pieces if one hundred thousand officeholders were turned out—they alone hold this country together, and the time never will arrive when they will consider it safe to surrender their salaries.—*Pittsburgh Post.*

The country is waiting with painful anxiety for Garfield's pledges on the rebel claims. Not because there is any chance of Garfield being President, but because he is a Senator elect already. He left the army on the field of battle to go to Congress and make appropriations to pay rebel claims, and the country demands that he pledge himself to stop that kind of voting.—*St. Louis Republican.*

At Republican headquarters in New York city it is deemed advisable not to entertain any hopes of success in Indiana. They say it "is a Democratic State, and strong influences are combined that cannot be overcome, except by extraordinary hard work and more favorable circumstances." They "pin their faith on New York; are determined, almost sure to carry it; but want no disappointment if Indiana fails."

## An Historical Parallel.

Forty years ago, Mr. Van Buren was in the Presidency, apparently as firmly settled as if clothed with an absolute right of succession. The great bank contest waged under Jackson had closed and culminated in the establishment of the Independent Treasury system under his successor. The Democratic party under Van Buren was in full enjoyment of all the Federal patronage, and his friends were skillful in its use and in all the appliances ordinarily employed for carrying elections. When renominated for a second election, his friends hardly dreamed his defeat possible; and even now, in looking back to that period, it is difficult to give an assignable reason for his defeat. Democratic policy had achieved its full triumph and left the party in full possession, with strong assurance of a new lease of power. The Whig party was the dominant one in opposition, but the anti-Masonic and Liberty parties constituted quite important elements, which the opponents of Mr. Van Buren thought it important to fuse into a common coalition, in order to oust the Democrats. General Harrison was the man selected for the occasion, greatly to the disgust of the friends of the great commoner, Henry Clay. But the leading idea was, that the country needed a change after so long a period of Democratic ascendancy. Both of the opposing forces went into the contest with remarkable vigor and enthusiasm. Maine then, as now, was the first to give the key note. Up to that time she had never broken away from the Democratic column, and was always relied on as one of the strongest holds of the Democratic party. In 1839, John Fairfield (Democrat) was elected over Edward Kent (Whig) by a majority of more than 6,000. But in September, 1840, the people had taken up the idea of the desirability of a change, and, for the first time, elected a Whig Governor. The vote in Maine was a complete surprise to the country, but the effect was talismanic, and, in truth and fact, settled the fate of the National Democratic party for that campaign. At the November election, Maine chose Harrison Electors, although the resistance was kept up to the last and with all the power at command. That was the first brick to tumble, and strong Democratic States all along the line immediately followed.

This year history is evidently about to repeat itself. The people have decreed a change. All the strongholds of power and patronage are in Republican hands. They have been a victorious party, and claim a new lease in virtue of what they have accomplished. The opposing forces, united, as in 1840, to effect a change, mean the same thing and will accomplish the same result. The popular enthusiasm, inspired by the name of Hancock, is far more intense and widespread than was excited by that of Harrison. Thousands upon thousands heretofore voting the Republican ticket are joining the standard of the great Union General, and the popular tide now, as in 1840, is so strong and under such successful headway that it will be impossible to resist its mighty sweep. Our older readers cannot fail to see the striking analogy between the contest of 1840 and that of 1840. The atmosphere is charged with indications of a great National Democratic victory throughout the length and breadth of the Union. We feel as sure of this as if the result were already achieved. If any are standing outside the camp, halting or hesitating as to where to go, as did Mr. Webster on one occasion, they may be assured that the path of victory has already been opened by the gallant sons of Maine; and when "the melancholy days of November" shall come, the old Democratic flag will be placed in triumph over the Capitol amidst National rejoicing over a Constitution saved and the Union again restored.—*Boston Post.*

**THE GREAT GERMAN REMEDY FOR RHEUMATISM, NEURALGIA, SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, BACKACHE, GOUT, SORENESS OF THE CHEST, SORE THROAT, QUINSY, SWELLINGS AND SPRAINS, FROSTED FEET AND BURNS AND SCALDS, General Bodily Pains, TOOTH, EAR AND HEADACHE, AND ALL OTHER PAINS AND ACHES.**

No Preparation on earth equals St. Jacob's Oil as a safe, sure, swift and cruel Enemy to Rheumatism. A true remedy for the comparatively trifling outlay of 50 CENTS, and every one suffering with pain can have long and positive proof of its claims. DIRECTIONS IN SEVEN LANGUAGES.

SOLD BY ALL DRUGGISTS AND DEALERS IN MEDICINE.

**A. VOGEL & CO.**  
Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

**MALT BITTERS**

One Five Thousand Dollar United States Registered Trade Mark. Malt Bitters is a pure and healthful beverage, and is sold by all druggists and dealers in medicine. It is a family medicine, and is sold by all druggists and dealers in medicine. It is a family medicine, and is sold by all druggists and dealers in medicine.

**FOR THE HAIR, BURNETT'S COCAINE**

ABSOLUTE CURE FOR DANDRUFF, BURNETT'S COCAINE CURES BALDNESS AND SOALD HEAD.

Beautifully Illuminated Floral Hand Book free. Send address to J. B. BURNETT & CO., Boston, Mass.

**WILSON'S FEVER AND AGUE TONIC**

FOR CHILLS AND FEVER AND ALL DISEASES CAUSED BY MALARIAL POISONING OF THE BLOOD. A Warranted Cure. Price, \$1.00.

**D'BULL'S COUGH SYRUP**

For the Coughs, Croup, Whooping Cough, Asthma, Bronchitis, Croup, Influenza, Whooping Cough, Infantile Consumption, &c. Price only 25 cents a bottle.

**AGENTS WANTED TO write at Extraordinary Offer!**

On our improved STANDARD BOOKS FAMILY BIBLES, and other best-selling books. Address: FORBES & McMAHON, 191 West Fifth St., Cincinnati, Ohio.

**C. GILBERT'S STARCH**

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ETIQUETTE & BUSINESS

**WELL AUGERS**

We make the only successful Well Boring and Rock Drilling Machine in the World! Don't buy until you see our circular, which we send FREE!

\$25 TO \$40 A DAY! Write for one of our circulars! Address: LOOMIS & NYMAN, TIFFIN, Ohio.